

Around Shannon's Interpretation for Entropy-preserving Stochastic Averages

Marie Choda

Osaka Kyoiku University, Osaka, Japan
marie@cc.osaka-kyoiku.ac.jp

Abstract

Let Φ be a positive unital Tr -preserving map on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. We give various characterizations for Φ to preserve the von Neumann entropy of a state ρ on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. Among others, it is given by that Φ behaves to ρ as a $*$ -automorphism. This is also equivalent to that the entropy of the stochastic matrix arising from $\{\rho, \Phi\}$ is zero.

keywords: Entropy, state, positive linear map, bistochastic matrix
Mathematics Subject Classification 2010: 46L55; 46L37, 46L40

1 Introduction

In this note, from the view point of the von Neumann entropy, we study the pair $\{\rho, \Phi\}$ of a state ρ and a positive unital Tr -preserving map Φ on the algebra $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ of $n \times n$ complex matrices, where Tr is the standard trace of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ so that $\text{Tr}(e) = 1$ for every minimal projection e in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$.

For a state ρ of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, the von Neumann entropy $S(\rho)$ is given as the von Neumann entropy $S(D_\rho)$ of the density operator D_ρ of ρ . If Φ is a positive unital Tr -preserving map on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, then $\Phi(D_\rho)$ plays the density operator of a new state of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ that is $\rho \circ \Phi^*$. It holds in general that $S(\rho) \leq S(\rho \circ \Phi^*)$ (i.e. $S(D_\rho) \leq S(\Phi(D_\rho))$) (see for example [3, 4, 5]).

We give in Theorem 3.3 below some characterizations for the equality of this relation. For an example, $S(D_\rho) = S(\Phi(D_\rho))$ if and only if Φ behaves for

ρ as a $*$ -automorphism of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, i.e. $\rho \circ \Phi^* = \rho \circ \alpha$ for some $*$ -automorphism α of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, in other words $\Phi(D_\rho) = u D_\rho u^*$ for some unitary u in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$.

This our formulation is an extended version of Shannon's interpretation in [7, p.395 4.] (a detailed description of which we denote in Section 3.1) for entropy-preserving stochastic averages

As a main tool, we pick up a bistochastic matrix $b_\rho(\Phi)$ arising from a given pair $\{\rho, \Phi\}$ of a state ρ and a positive unital Tr-preserving map Φ .

Based on the notion of weighted entropy for a bistochastic matrix introduced in [10], we define the entropy $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi))$ of this bistochastic matrix $b_\rho(\Phi)$ with respect to the probability vector λ by the eigenvalues of D_ρ .

Another entropic object $S_\rho(\Phi)$ (which we give below) is arising as an average of a family of von Neumann entropy coming from D_ρ via Φ .

We show in Theorem 3.10 the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} S_\rho(\Phi) \leq H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) \leq S(\rho \circ \Phi^*) \leq S(\rho) + S_\rho(\Phi) \\ \qquad \qquad \qquad \vee \parallel \\ \qquad \qquad \qquad S(\rho) \end{aligned}$$

together with characterizations for the each equality, and in Theorem 3.14 we show that $S(D_\rho) = S(\Phi(D_\rho))$ if and only if $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = 0$.

2 Preliminaries

Here we summarize notations, terminologies and basic facts.

2.1. The *entropy function* η is defined on $[0, 1]$ by

$$\eta(t) = -t \log t \quad (0 < t \leq 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \eta(0) = 0.$$

The η is *strictly operator-concave*, i.e. for a k -tuple of real numbers $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^k$ such that $t_i > 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^k t_i = 1$ and bounded self-adjoint operators $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^k$ with spectra in $[0, 1]$, it holds in general that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k t_i \eta(x_i) \leq \eta\left(\sum_{i=1}^k t_i x_i\right)$$

and the equality implies that $x_i = x_j$ for all i, j . (see for example [3, B], [4, 5]).

2.2. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ be a probability vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The *Shannon entropy* $H(\lambda)$ for λ is given as

$$H(\lambda) = \eta(\lambda_1) + \dots + \eta(\lambda_n).$$

It holds always that $H(\lambda) \leq \log n$ and $H(\lambda) \leq H(\lambda b)$ ([7], cf.[6]) for a *bistochastic* matrix $b = [b_{ij}]$ (i.e. $b_{ij} \geq 0$, $\sum_i b_{ij} = \sum_j b_{ij} = 1$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$). A bistochastic matrix is also called a *doubly stochastic* matrix (see for example [5]).

2.3. Every positive linear functional ϕ on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ is of the form $\phi(x) = \text{Tr}(D_\phi x)$, ($x \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$) for a unique positive element D_ϕ in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, which is called the *density operator* or *density matrix*. The density matrix of a state ρ is characterized as a positive operator D_ρ such that $\text{Tr}(D_\rho) = 1$.

Using the eigenvalue list $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ of D_ϕ , the *von Neumann entropy* $S(\phi)$ for a positive linear functional ϕ and the *von Neumann entropy* $S(D_\phi)$ for D_ϕ are defined by

$$S(\phi) = S(D_\phi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \eta(\lambda_i).$$

If ρ is a state of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, then the eigenvalue vector $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ of D_ρ is a probability vector and so $S(\rho) = S(D_\rho) = H(\lambda)$.

3 Pairs $\{\rho, \Phi\}$ of states and positive maps

Let ρ be a state of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, and let D_ρ be the density matrix of ρ . Let $\Phi : M_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{C})$ be a positive unital Tr-preserving map. Then $\Phi(D_\rho)$ is a positive operator in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ and $\text{Tr}(\Phi(D_\rho)) = 1$.

In order to see the state whose density matrix is $\Phi(D_\rho)$, we need the system of the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. The inner product is given by $\langle x, y \rangle = \text{Tr}(y^* x)$ for $x, y \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ and the adjoint map $\Phi^* : M_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{C})$ of Φ is given by $\text{Tr}(y \Phi^*(x)) = \text{Tr}(\Phi(y)x)$ for $x, y \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$.

Since Φ is positive and Tr-preserving, it implies that Φ^* is positive and unital so that $\rho \circ \Phi^*$ is a state, whose density matrix is $\Phi(D_\rho)$:

$$\rho \circ \Phi^*(x) = \text{Tr}(D_\rho \Phi^*(x)) = \text{Tr}(\Phi(D_\rho)x), \quad (x \in M_n(\mathbb{C})).$$

Let

$$\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n),$$

be the probability vectors of the eigenvalues of D_ρ and $\Phi(D_\rho)$ respectively. Here we arrange them always in a decreasing order:

$$\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_n.$$

Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ (resp. $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$) be the mutually orthogonal minimal projections inducing the following decomposition of D_ρ (resp. $\Phi(D_\rho)$):

$$D_\rho = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i e_i \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(D_\rho) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j p_j. \quad (3.1)$$

We denote by $u_{(\rho, \Phi)}$ the unitary such that

$$u_{(\rho, \Phi)} e_i u_{(\rho, \Phi)}^* = p_i, \quad \text{for each } i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3.2)$$

Also we denote by A (resp. B) the maximal abelian subalgebra of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ generated by $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ (resp. $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$).

3.1 A generalization of Shannon's interpretation

The motivation of this note is to give a generalized version of Shannon's interpretation for entropy-preserving stochastic averages of probability vectors in the framework of von Neumann entropy for states on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$.

Shannon denotes in [7, p.395 4.] as the followings: If we perform any "averaging" operation on the $p = \{p_i\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$ of the form

$$p'_i = \sum_j a_{ij} p_j$$

(where $a_{ij} \geq 0$, $\sum_i a_{ij} = \sum_j a_{ij} = 1$), the entropy H increases (except in the special case where this transformation amounts to no more than a permutation of the p_i with H of course remaining the same).

A detailed explanation for this was presented in [6] together with some characterizations for pairs $\{p, [a_{ij}]\}$ of entropy-preserving stochastic averages.

By replacing a probability vector (resp. a bistochastic matrix) to a state ρ of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ (resp. a unital positive Tr -preserving map Φ on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$), we show here that the action of Φ on ρ preserves the von Neumann entropy if and only if Φ behaves just as an automorphism for the state ρ .

3.1.1 Bistochastic matrix $b_\rho(\Phi)$ for the pair $\{\rho, \Phi\}$

A matrix $b = [b_{ij}] \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ is called a bistochastic matrix if

$$b_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = \sum_j b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = 1, \quad \text{for all } i, j$$

For a state ρ of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ and a unital positive Tr-preserving map Φ on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, we denote by $b_\rho(\Phi)$ the matrix given by

$$b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = \text{Tr}(\Phi(e_i)p_j), \quad (1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n). \quad (3.3)$$

Assume that $\lambda_i > \lambda_{i+1}$ and $\mu_i > \mu_{i+1}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Then the value $b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}$ is uniquely determined for all i, j because the spectral projections $\{e_i\}_i$ and $\{p_j\}_j$ are uniquely determined. In the other case, the value $b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}$ is not always uniquely determined. For an example, if it happened that $D = \sum_i \lambda_i f_i$ and $\Phi(D) = \sum_j \mu_j q_j$ for some projections $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{q_j\}_{j=1}^n$ different from $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{p_j\}_{j=1}^n$, then the matrix $b_\rho(\Phi)^{e,p}$ with the i, j -coefficient $\text{Tr}(\Phi(e_i)p_j)$ may be different from the matrix $b_\rho(\Phi)^{f,q}$ with the i, j -coefficient $\text{Tr}(\Phi(f_i)q_j)$. But the difference is covered by the permutation matrices $[\sigma]$ and $[\pi]$ via the permutations σ and π such that $f_i = e_{\sigma(i)}$ and $q_i = p_{\sigma(i)}$ for all i and j : $b_\rho(\Phi)^{f,q} = [\sigma]b_\rho(\Phi)^{e,p}[\pi]$.

We show later that our discussions do not depend on these kind of matrix representations and so we denote simply by $b_\rho(\Phi)$.

Lemma 3.1. (1) *The $b_\rho(\Phi)$ is a bistochastic matrix.*

(2) *The $b_\rho(\Phi)$ transposes the vector λ to the vector μ , i.e. $\lambda b_\rho(\Phi) = \mu$.*

Proof. (1) Since Φ is positive, it holds that $b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = \text{Tr}(p_j \Phi(e_i) p_j) \geq 0$ for all i and j . The condition that $\text{Tr} \circ \Phi = \text{Tr}$ implies that for all i

$$\sum_j b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = \sum_j \text{Tr}(\Phi(e_i)p_j) = \text{Tr}(\Phi(e_i) \sum_j p_j) = \text{Tr}(\Phi(e_i)) = 1,$$

and condition that $\Phi(1_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}) = 1_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}$ implies that for all j

$$\sum_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = \sum_i \text{Tr}(\Phi(e_i)p_j) = \text{Tr}(\Phi(\sum_i e_i)p_j) = \text{Tr}(p_j) = 1,$$

so that $b_\rho(\Phi)$ is a bistochastic matrix.

(2) For all j , we have that

$$\mu_j = \text{Tr}(\Phi(D_\rho)p_j) = \text{Tr}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \Phi(e_i)p_j\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}.$$

This means that $\mu = \lambda b_\rho(\Phi)$. □

For each j , we set

$$I_j = \{i : b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} \neq 0\}. \quad (3.4)$$

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that $S(\Phi(D_\rho)) = S(D_\rho)$. Then, for each j ,*

$$\lambda_i = \lambda_k \quad \text{for all } i, k \in I_j.$$

Proof. Since η is concave, by Lemma 3.1 (2) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \eta(\lambda_i) &= \sum_i \sum_j b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} \eta(\lambda_i) = \sum_j \sum_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} \eta(\lambda_i) \\ &\leq \sum_j \eta\left(\sum_i \lambda_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}\right) = \sum_j \eta(\mu_j) = S(\Phi(D_\rho)) = S(\rho) = \sum_i \eta(\lambda_i) \end{aligned}$$

so that $\eta(\sum_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} \lambda_i) = \sum_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} \eta(\lambda_i)$.

This implies that $\lambda_i = \lambda_k$ for all $i, k \in I_j$ because η is strictly concave. □

Under the assumption that $S(\Phi(D_\rho)) = S(D_\rho)$, for $i \in I_j$ we denote the constant λ_i in Lemma 3.2 by $\lambda^{(j)}$. Remark that each I_j is a non empty set because $b_\rho(\Phi)$ is a bistochastic matrix, and

$$\lambda^{(j)} = \frac{\sum_{i \in I_j} \lambda_i}{|I_j|} = \lambda_k \quad \text{for all } k \in I_j. \quad (3.5)$$

Theorem 3.3. *Let ρ be a state of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ and let $\Phi : M_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{C})$ be a unital positive Tr -preserving map. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $S(\rho \circ \Phi^*) = S(\rho)$, i.e. $S(\Phi(D_\rho)) = S(D_\rho)$.
- (ii) $\lambda = \mu b_\rho(\Phi)^T$, where x^T denotes the transpose of the matrix x .
- (iii) $\lambda_i = \mu_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.
- (iv) $\Phi(D_\rho) = u D_\rho u^*$ for some unitary $u \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$.
- (v) $\Phi^* \Phi(D_\rho) = D_\rho$.

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): By Lemma 3.2, we have that for each j ,

$$\mu_j = \sum_i \lambda_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = \sum_{i \in I_j} \lambda_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = \lambda^{(j)} \sum_{i \in I_j} b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = \lambda^{(j)}.$$

If $b_\rho(\Phi)_{kj} \neq 0$, then $k \in I_j$ and

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j b_\rho(\Phi)_{kj} = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda^{(j)} b_\rho(\Phi)_{kj} = \sum_{j \in \{l: b_\rho(\Phi)_{kl} \neq 0\}} \lambda^{(j)} b_\rho(\Phi)_{kj} = \lambda_k,$$

this means that $\mu b_\rho(\Phi)^T = \lambda$.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii): Remember the following fact in the majorization theory (for example, see [5]): if λ and μ are probability vectors such that $\lambda b = \mu$ for a bistochastic matrix b , then μ is majorized by λ , that is,

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \quad \text{for all } k = 1, \dots, n.$$

The relation (ii) implies that λ is majorized by μ and also Lemma 3.1 implies that μ is majorized by λ . Hence $\lambda_i = \mu_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv): Assume that $\lambda_i = \mu_i$ for all i . Then

$$\Phi(D_\rho) = \sum_j \mu_j p_j = \sum_j \lambda_j u_{(\rho, \Phi)} e_j u_{(\rho, \Phi)}^* = u_{(\rho, \Phi)} D_\rho u_{(\rho, \Phi)}^*.$$

(iv) $\Rightarrow$ (v): It is sufficient to show that $\|\Phi^* \Phi(D_\rho) - D_\rho\|_2 = 0$.

Since Φ is unital, i.e., $\Phi(1) = 1$, it implies that $\text{Tr } \Phi^* = \text{Tr}$. Also since the positive map Φ^* satisfies the Kadison-Schwartz inequality for the positive operator $\Phi(D_\rho)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi^*(\Phi(D_\rho))\|_2^2 &= \text{Tr}((\Phi^*(\Phi(D_\rho)))^*(\Phi^*(\Phi(D_\rho)))) \\ &\leq \text{Tr}(\Phi^*(\Phi(D_\rho)^* \Phi(D_\rho))) = \text{Tr}((\Phi(D_\rho))^* \Phi(D_\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence by the condition (iv)

$$\|\Phi^*(\Phi(D_\rho))\|_2 \leq \text{Tr}((\Phi(D_\rho))^* \Phi(D_\rho)) = \text{Tr}(u D_\rho^* u^* u D_\rho u^*) = \|D_\rho\|_2$$

and

$$< \Phi^* \Phi(D_\rho), D_\rho >_{Tr} = \text{Tr}((\Phi(D_\rho))^* \Phi(D_\rho)) = \|D_\rho\|_2^2.$$

These imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \|\Phi^*\Phi(D_\rho) - D_\rho\|_2^2 \\
&= \text{Tr}((\Phi^*\Phi(D_\rho) - D_\rho)^*(\Phi^*\Phi(D_\rho) - D_\rho)) \\
&= \|\Phi^*\Phi(D_\rho)\|_2^2 - 2\langle \Phi^*\Phi(D_\rho), D_\rho \rangle + \|D_\rho\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \|D_\rho\|_2^2 - \|D_\rho\|_2^2 = 0
\end{aligned}$$

so that $\Phi^*\Phi(D_\rho) = D_\rho$.

(v) $\Rightarrow$ (i): Since Φ and Φ^* are unital positive Tr-preserving, we have that $S(D_\rho) = S(\Phi^*\Phi(D_\rho)) \geq S(\Phi(D_\rho)) \geq S(D_\rho)$ so that $S(D_\rho) = S(\Phi(D_\rho))$. $\square$

Remark 3.4. Under the assumption that Φ is 2-positive, the corresponding relation to (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (v) in Theorem 3.3 is obtained for the discussion on the relative entropy in [2, Theorem 7.1] (cf. [9] as an application of [2]).

In our case, Φ is not necessary to be 2-positive.

Example 3.5. Now we pick up the transpose mapping $\Phi : x \rightarrow x^T$ on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. It is a typical example of unital Tr-preserving positive but not 2-positive map. The Φ satisfies the conditions in Theorem 3.3 for all state ρ .

In fact, the Φ is a symmetry as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \Phi^*(x), y \rangle &= \langle x, \Phi(y) \rangle = \text{Tr}(\Phi(y)^*x) = \text{Tr}((y^T)^*x) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^n \overline{y_{i,j}} x_{j,i} = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \overline{y_{j,i}} x_{i,j} = \text{Tr}(y^*x^T) = \text{Tr}(y^*\Phi(x)) \\
&= \langle \Phi(x), y \rangle \quad \text{for all } x = (x_{ij}), y = (y_{ij}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\Phi^*\Phi$ is the identity map on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ so that (v) in Theorem 3.3 is trivial.

Remark 3.6. If the state ρ in Theorem 3.3 is the normalized trace Tr/n , then $D_\rho = I_n/n$ so that the statements (i) - (v) are all trivial for every Φ .

Remark 3.7. The statements (i) and (iv) in Theorem 3.3 are extended versions of the statements 1 and 4 in [6, Theorem 4.5] respectively. The statement (ii) in Theorem 3.3 is nothing else but $\lambda = \lambda b_\rho(\Phi) b_\rho(\Phi)^T$, which corresponds with the statement 3 in [6, Theorem 4.5].

Corollary 3.8. (1) If $S(\Phi(D_\rho)) = S(\rho)$, then

$$\langle \Phi(D_\rho), \Phi(e_k) \rangle = \langle D_\rho, e_k \rangle \text{ for all } k.$$

(2) If E_B is the conditional expectation of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ onto B , then

$$S(E_B(D_\rho)) = S(D_\rho) \text{ if and only if } D_\rho \in B.$$

Proof. (1): The assumption and (ii) of Theorem 3.3 imply that for each k

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\Phi^*(\Phi(D_\rho))e_k) &= \text{Tr}(\Phi(D_\rho)\Phi(e_k)) = \text{Tr}\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j p_j \Phi(e_k)\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j \text{Tr}(p_j \Phi(e_k)) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j b_\rho(\Phi)_{kj} = \lambda_k, \end{aligned}$$

so that $\langle \Phi(D_\rho), \Phi(e_k) \rangle = \text{Tr}(\Phi^* \Phi(D_\rho) e_k) = \lambda_k = \langle \rho, e_k \rangle$ for all k .

(2): A conditional expectation E satisfies that $E^*E = E$. Hence by (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (v) in Theorem 3.3, we have that $S(E_B(D_\rho)) = S(D_\rho)$ if and only if $D_\rho = E_B^* E_B(D_\rho) = E_B(D_\rho)$ which means that $D_\rho \in B$. $\square$

3.2 Relations among various entropies

In this section, we discuss about various kinds of entropy under the same notations with in Section 3.1: for a state ρ and a positive unital Tr -preserving map Φ of the algebra $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, the probability vector $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ (resp. $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$) is given by eigenvalues of D_ρ (resp. $\Phi(D_\rho)$) whose corresponding minimal projections are $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ (resp. $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$), and A (resp. B) is the subalgebra generated by $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ (resp. $\{p_j\}_{j=1}^n$).

3.2.1. We apply the notion of the weighted entropy for a bistochastic matrix defined in [10] to our bistochastic matrix $b_\rho(\Phi)$. We let

$$H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \sum_{j=1}^n \eta(b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}) \quad \text{and} \quad H_\mu(b_\rho(\Phi)) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j \sum_{i=1}^n \eta(b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}).$$

This is well defined, i.e. the values $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi))$ and $H_\mu(b_\rho(\Phi))$ depend on only the pair $\{\rho, \Phi\}$. In fact, assume that $D_\rho = \sum_i \lambda_i f_i$ and $\Phi(D_\rho) = \sum_j \mu_j q_j$

for minimal projections $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{q_j\}_{j=1}^n$ which are not always same as $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{p_j\}_{j=1}^n$. Then there are permutations σ and π of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $f_i = e_{\sigma(i)}$ and $q_i = p_{\pi(i)}$ for all i . Remark that $\lambda_i = \lambda_{\sigma(i)}$ for all i , then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \sum_{j=1}^n \eta(\text{Tr}(\Phi(f_i)q_j)) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \sum_{j=1}^n \eta(\text{Tr}(\Phi(e_{\sigma(i)})p_{\pi(j)})) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{\sigma(i)} \sum_{j=1}^n \eta(\text{Tr}(\Phi(e_{\sigma(i)})p_{\pi(j)})) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \sum_{j=1}^n \eta(\text{Tr}(\Phi(e_i)p_j)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the value $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi))$ does not depend on the choice of minimal projections. Similarly it holds for $H_\mu(b_\rho(\Phi))$ by that $\mu_j = \mu_{\pi(j)}$ for all j .

3.2.2. Since Φ is positive unital Tr-preserving map, $\Phi(e_i)$ and $\Phi^*(p_j)$ are density matrices for all i, j . We put $S_\rho(\Phi)$ and $S^\rho(\Phi^*)$ as the followings:

$$S_\rho(\Phi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i S(\Phi(e_i)) \quad \text{and} \quad S^\rho(\Phi^*) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j S(\Phi^*(p_j)).$$

Similarly to the case of $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi))$ and $H_\mu(b_\rho(\Phi))$, the values $S_\rho(\Phi)$ and $S^\rho(\Phi^*)$ are uniquely determined by the pair $\{\rho, \Phi\}$.

Proposition 3.9. *For the conditional expectation E_B (resp. E_A) onto B (resp. A), the followings hold:*

1. $E_B(\Phi(e_i)) = \sum_{j=1}^n b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} p_j$, $E_A(\Phi^*(p_j)) = \sum_{i=1}^n b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} e_i$,
2. $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = \sum_i \lambda_i S(E_B(\Phi(e_i)))$, $H_\mu(b_\rho(\Phi)) = \sum_j \mu_j S(E_A(\Phi^*(p_j)))$.

Proof. 1: It is clear that $E_B(\Phi(e_i))$ is a density matrix for all i . The E_B is given by $E_B(x) = \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Tr}(p_j x) p_j$ for all $x \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$. Hence we have the form for $E_B(\Phi(e_i))$ and similarly for $E_A(\Phi^*(p_j))$.

2: By the definition, we have that $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \sum_{j=1}^n \eta(b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i S(E_B(\Phi(e_i)))$ and similarly the statements about $H_\mu(b_\rho(\Phi))$. $\square$

For a probability vector $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, we set

$$J_\lambda = \{k; \lambda_k \neq 0\}. \tag{3.6}$$

Theorem 3.10. *Let ρ be a state of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, and let Φ be a unital positive Tr-preserving map on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. Then the following statements hold:*

(1)

$$S_\rho(\Phi) \leq H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) \leq S(\rho \circ \Phi^*) \leq S(\rho) + S_\rho(\Phi)$$

$$\quad \vee \parallel$$

$$S(\rho)$$

(2) $S_\rho(\Phi) = H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi))$ if and only if $\Phi(e_i) \in B$ for all $i \in J_\lambda$:

$$\Phi(e_i) = \sum_{j=1}^n b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} p_j, \quad \text{for all } i \in J_\lambda.$$

(3) $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = S(\rho \circ \Phi^*)$ if and only if $b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = \mu_j$ for all $i \in J_\lambda$ and j :

$$\Phi(D_\rho) = \sum_{j=1}^n b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} p_j.$$

(4) $S_\rho(\Phi) = S(\rho \circ \Phi^*)$ if and only if $\Phi(D_\rho) = \Phi(e_i)$ for every $i \in J_\lambda$.

(5) $S(\rho \circ \Phi^*) = S(\rho) + S_\rho(\Phi)$ if and only if the ρ is a pure state.

Proof. (1): Since E_B is a unital positive Tr-preserving mapping, we have that $S(\Phi(e_i)) \leq S(E_B(\Phi(e_i)))$ for all i , and by Proposition 3.9

$$S_\rho(\Phi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i S(\Phi(e_i)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i S(E_B(\Phi(e_i))) = H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)).$$

On the other hand, η is concave and $\lambda b_\rho(\Phi) = \mu$, we have that

$$H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = \sum_j \sum_i \lambda_i \eta(b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}) \leq \sum_j \eta\left(\sum_i \lambda_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}\right) = S(\Phi(D_\rho)).$$

The inequality $S(\Phi(D_\rho)) \leq S(D_\rho) + S_\rho(\Phi)$ is induced by the inequality for convex combinations of density operators (cf. [3, 4, 5]) but we denote a computation which we need below to prove (5).

Since Φ is Tr-preserving, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} S(\Phi(D_\rho)) &= S\left(\sum_i \lambda_i \Phi(e_i)\right) \leq \sum_i S(\lambda_i \Phi(e_i)) = \sum_i \text{Tr}(\eta(\lambda_i \Phi(e_i))) \\ &= \sum_i \text{Tr}(\eta(\lambda_i) \Phi(e_i) + \lambda_i \eta(\Phi(e_i))) = S(D_\rho) + S_\rho(\Phi). \end{aligned}$$

The relation that $S(\rho) \leq S(\rho \circ \Phi^*)$ is known, and the all relations in (1) hold.

(2): If $S_\rho(\Phi) = H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi))$, then $\sum_i \lambda_i S(\Phi(e_i)) = \sum_i \lambda_i S(E_B(\Phi(e_i)))$. Since $S(\Phi(e_i)) \leq S(E_B(\Phi(e_i)))$ for all i , this implies that $\lambda_i S(\Phi(e_i)) = \lambda_i S(E_B(\Phi(e_i)))$ for all i so that $S(\Phi(e_i)) = S(E_B(\Phi(e_i)))$ for all $i \in J_\lambda$.

Now we apply Theorem 3.3 to the pair $\{\Phi(e_i), E_B\}$ for each $i \in J_\lambda$. Then by the property of the conditional expectation that $E_B = E_B^* E_B$

$$E_B(\Phi(e_i)) = E_B^* E_B(\Phi(e_i)) = \Phi(e_i) \quad \text{for each } i \in J_\lambda.$$

This means that $\Phi(e_i) \in B$ for all $i \in J_\lambda$.

Conversely assume that $\Phi(e_i) \in B$ for all $i \in J_\lambda$. Then

$$S_\rho(\Phi) = \sum_{i \in J_\lambda} \lambda_i S(\Phi(e_i)) = \sum_{i \in J_\lambda} \lambda_i S(E_B(\Phi(e_i))) = H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)).$$

We remark that $\Phi(e_i) \in B$ if and only if $\Phi(e_i) = \sum_{j=1}^n b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} p_j$. In fact, if $\Phi(e_i) \in B$, then there exists $\{\alpha_{ij}\}_j \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that $\Phi(e_i) = \sum_j \alpha_{ij} p_j$, which implies that $\alpha_{ij} = \text{Tr}(\Phi(e_i) p_j) = b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}$ so that $\Phi(e_i) = \sum_{j=1}^n b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} p_j$. It is obvious that $\Phi(e_i) = \sum_{j=1}^n b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} p_j \in B$.

(3): Assume that $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = S(\rho \circ \Phi^*)$ (so that $= S(\Phi(D_\rho))$). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j \sum_i \lambda_i \eta(b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}) &= H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = S(\Phi(D_\rho)) \\ &= \sum_j \eta(\mu_j) = \sum_j \eta\left(\sum_i \lambda_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}\right). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\sum_i \lambda_i \eta(b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}) = \eta\left(\sum_i \lambda_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}\right) \quad \text{for all } j$$

because in general $\sum_i \lambda_i \eta(b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}) \leq \eta(\sum_i \lambda_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij})$ for all j by the fact that η is concave. Moreover η is strictly concave, so that for each j

$$b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = b_\rho(\Phi)_{i'j} \quad \text{for all } i, i' \in J_\lambda.$$

The $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ is a probability vector so that there exists a k with $\lambda_k \neq 0$, which we fix. If $\lambda_i \neq 0$, then $b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = b_\rho(\Phi)_{kj}$ for all j . Hence

$$\mu_j = \sum_i \lambda_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = \sum_{i \in J_\lambda} \lambda_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = \sum_{i \in J_\lambda} \lambda_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{kj} = b_\rho(\Phi)_{kj}, \text{ for all } j.$$

Conversely assume that for each j , $b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = \mu_j$ for all $i \in J_\lambda$. Then

$$H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = \sum_{i \in J_\lambda} \lambda_i \sum_j \eta(b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}) = \sum_{i \in J_\lambda} \lambda_i \sum_j \eta(\mu_j) = S(\Phi(D_\rho)).$$

(4): If $S_\rho(\Phi) = S(\rho \circ \Phi^*)$, then $\text{Tr}(\sum_i \lambda_i \eta(\Phi(e_i))) = \text{Tr}(\eta(\sum_i \lambda_i \Phi(e_i)))$. This implies that $\sum_{i \in J_\lambda} \lambda_i \eta(\Phi(e_i)) = \eta(\sum_{i \in J_\lambda} \lambda_i \Phi(e_i))$ because η is operator-concave and Tr is faithful. Moreover η is strictly operator-concave. Hence $\Phi(e_i) = \Phi(e_j)$ for all $i, j \in J_\lambda$ and we have that

$$\Phi(D_\rho) = \sum_{i \in J_\lambda} \lambda_i \Phi(e_i) = \Phi(e_i) \text{ for all } i \in J_\lambda.$$

Conversely assume that $\Phi(D_\rho) = \Phi(e_i)$ for every $i \in J_\lambda$. Then $\Phi(e_k) = \Phi(e_i)$ for all $k, i \in J_\lambda$. Let us fix an i in J_λ . Then for all $j = 1, \dots, n$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_j &= \sum_k \lambda_k b_\rho(\Phi)_{kj} = \sum_{k \in J_\lambda} \lambda_k b_\rho(\Phi)_{kj} = \sum_{k \in J_\lambda} \lambda_k \text{Tr}(\Phi(e_k) p_j) \\ &= \sum_{k \in J_\lambda} \lambda_k \text{Tr}(\Phi(e_i) p_j) = \text{Tr}(\Phi(e_i) p_j) = b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by (3) we have that $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = S(\rho \circ \Phi^*)$.

On the other hand, the assumption that $\Phi(D_\rho) = \Phi(e_i)$ for every $i \in J_\lambda$ implies clearly that $\Phi(e_i) \in B$ for all $i \in J_\lambda$ so that $S_\rho(\Phi) = H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi))$ by (2). Thus we have that $S_\rho(\Phi) = S(\rho \circ \Phi^*)$.

(5) Assume that $S(\rho \circ \Phi^*) = S(\rho) + S_\rho(\Phi)$. By the computation in (1) for $S(\rho \circ \Phi^*) \leq S(\rho) + S_\rho(\Phi)$, we have that $\text{Tr}(\eta(\sum_i \lambda_i \Phi(e_i))) = \text{Tr}(\sum_i \eta(\lambda_i \Phi(e_i)))$. On the other hand, $\eta(\sum_i \lambda_i \Phi(e_i)) \leq \sum_i \eta(\lambda_i \Phi(e_i))$ because η is operator concave. These two relations imply that $\eta(\sum_i \lambda_i \Phi(e_i)) = \sum_i \eta(\lambda_i \Phi(e_i))$ by the faithfulness of Tr . Again by the fact that η is strictly operator concave, we have that $\Phi(e_i) = \Phi(e_j)$ for all $i, j \in J_\lambda$ so that $\Phi(D_\rho) = \Phi(e_i)$ for all $i \in J_\lambda$. By combining with (4), this implies that $S_\rho(\Phi) = S(\rho \circ \Phi^*)$ so that by the assumption $S(\rho) = 0$ and so ρ is a pure state,

Conversely if ρ is a pure state, then $S(\rho) = 0$. Hence by (1) $S_\rho(\Phi) \leq S(\rho \circ \Phi^*) \leq S_\rho(\Phi)$ so that $S(\rho \circ \Phi^*) = S_\rho(\Phi) = S(\rho) + S_\rho(\Phi)$. $\square$

Corollary 3.11. *Assume that all eigenvalues of D_ρ are nonzero and that $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = S(\rho \circ \Phi^*)$. Then for all Φ the state $\rho \circ \Phi^*$ is the canonical tracial state, i.e. Tr/n and so that $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = S(\rho \circ \Phi^*) = \log n$.*

Proof. If $\lambda_i \neq 0$ for all i and if $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = S(\Phi(D_\rho))$, then by (3) of Theorem 3.10 $\mu_j = b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}$ for all i, j so that $n\mu_j = \sum_i b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = 1$ for all j . Hence $\mu_j = 1/n$ for all j . This means that $\Phi(D_\rho)$ is the density matrix of the normalized trace Tr/n so that $S(\Phi(D_\rho)) = \log n$. $\square$

Remark 3.12. A bistochastic matrix b is said to be *unistochastic* if it is induced from some unitary matrix u by the method that $b_{i,j} = |u_{i,j}|^2$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. An $n \times n$ unitary matrix u is called a *Hadamard matrix* if $|u_{i,j}| = 1/\sqrt{n}$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$.

The above corollary shows that if all eigenvalues of D_ρ are non-zero and if $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = S(\Phi(D_\rho))$ then $b_\rho(\Phi)$ is a unistochastic matrix induced from a Hadamard matrix.

Example 3.13. (1) Assume that ρ is a pure state. Then it is clear that

$$S(\rho) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad S_\rho(\Phi) = H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = S(\rho \circ \Phi^*)$$

for every positive unital Tr -preserving map Φ .

Furthermore, for any given value s with $0 \leq s \leq \log n$, there exists a positive unital Tr -preserving map Φ such that $S_\rho(\Phi) = s$.

In fact, we may assume that $D_\rho = e_1$. Since $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ are minimal mutually orthogonal projections, there exists a family of partial isometries $\{v_{ji} : j, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ such that $v_{ji}v_{ji}^* = e_j$ and $v_{ji}^*v_{ji} = e_i$. Choose an n -tuple of numbers μ_j such that $\mu_j \geq 0$, $\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j = 1$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n \eta(\mu_j) = s$. We define the map Φ by

$$\Phi(x) = \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_{j+k-1} v_{jk} x v_{jk}^* \pmod{n}, \quad x \in M_n(\mathbb{C}).$$

Then Φ satisfies the conditions and

$$S_\rho(\Phi) = S(\Phi(e_1)) = \text{Tr}(\eta(\sum_j \mu_j e_j)) = \sum_j \eta(\mu_j) = s.$$

(2) If Φ is a $*$ -isomorphism, then for each state ρ ,

$$S_\rho(\Phi) = H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad S(\rho \circ \Phi^*) = S(\rho).$$

In fact, $\Phi(e_i)$ is a minimal projection for all i and the set $\{\lambda_i\}_i$ coincides with the set $\{\mu_i\}_i$. Hence $S_\rho(\Phi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i S(\Phi(e_i)) = 0$ and $\text{Tr}(\Phi(e_i)p_j) = 0$ for all i, j so that $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = 0$. Obviously $S(\Phi(D_\rho)) = S(D_\rho)$.

(3) If Φ is a map $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}1_M$, then for every state ρ

$$S_\rho(\Phi) = H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = S(\rho \circ \Phi^*) = \log n.$$

In fact, each $\Phi(e_i)$ is $\alpha_i 1_M$ for some $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}$. Hence $1 = \text{Tr}(e_i) = \text{Tr}(\Phi(e_i)) = \alpha_i \text{Tr}(\Phi(1_M)) = \alpha_i n$, i.e., $\Phi(e_i) = \frac{1}{n} 1_M$. This implies that $S_\rho(\Phi) = \sum_i \lambda_i S(1_M/n) = \text{Tr}(\eta(1_M/n)) = \log n$. In general $S_\rho(\Phi) \leq H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) \leq S(\rho \circ \Phi^*) \leq \log n$ for every state ρ . Hence we have the conclusion.

(4) A typical counter example of Φ for Theorem 3.10 (4) is the transpose mapping $\Phi(x) = x^T$, where ρ is not a pure state.

More general examples are given as follows: Let $D = \sum_i \lambda_i e_i$ be a given density matrix. Let $\{p_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be mutually orthogonal minimal projections. Then we have a family of partial isometries $\{v_{ij}\}_{ij}$ such that $v_{ij}^* v_{ij} = e_j$ and $v_{ij} v_{ij}^* = p_j$. Let $a = [a_{ij}]$ be a bistochastic matrix and let

$$\Phi(x) = \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} v_{ij} x v_{ij}^*, \quad (x \in M_n(\mathbb{C})).$$

Then Φ is a unital positive Tr -preserving map and

$$\Phi(D) = \sum_i \left(\sum_j a_{ij} \lambda_j \right) p_i \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(e_i) = \sum_j a_{ji} p_j \quad \text{for all } i.$$

Hence $\Phi(e_i) \in B$ for all i , that is the condition in Theorem 3.10 (2).

Also we can choose bistochastic matrices $a = [a_{ij}]$, one of which induces Φ satisfying the condition (4) in Theorem 3.10 and the other of which induces Φ not satisfying the condition (4) in Theorem 3.10.

At the last, we give the following characterization:

Theorem 3.14. *Let ρ be a state of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, and let Φ be a unital positive Tr-preserving map on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- 0) $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = 0$,
- 1) for each $i \in J_\lambda$, there exists a unique $j(i)$ such that

$$\lambda_i = \mu_{j(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(e_i) = p_{j(i)},$$

- 2) $S(\rho) = S(\rho \circ \Phi^*)$,
- 3) there exists a unitary u such that $\Phi(D_\rho) = uD_\rho u^*$,
- 4) $\Phi^*\Phi(D_\rho) = D_\rho$.

Proof. 0) $\Rightarrow$ 1): Assume that $H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = 0$. Then $\sum_{i \in J_\lambda} \lambda_i \sum_j \eta(b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}) = 0$ which implies that, for each $i \in J_\lambda$, $b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij}$ is either 0 or 1 for all j .

Let us fix an $i \in J_\lambda$. Then we have a unique $j(i)$ with $b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = \delta_{j,j(i)}$ by that $\sum_j b_\rho(\Phi)_{ij} = 1$. Furthermore since $\sum_k b_\rho(\Phi)_{kj(i)} = 1$ it holds that $b_\rho(\Phi)_{kj(i)} = \delta_{k,i}$. As a consequence, for this $j(i)$, we have that

$$b_\rho(\Phi)_{kj(i)} = \delta_{k,i} \quad \text{for all} \quad k = 1, \dots, n.$$

Remember that $\lambda b_\rho(\Phi) = \mu$ by Lemma 3.1. This implies that $\mu_{j(i)} = \lambda_i$ for all $i \in J_\lambda$ so that $\Phi(e_i) = p_{j(i)}$ for all $i \in J_\lambda$ because $\sum_i \lambda_i \Phi(e_i) = \Phi(D_\rho) = \sum_i p_{j(i)} p_{j(i)}$.

1) $\Rightarrow$ 0): For all $i \in J_\lambda$, we have that $E_B(\Phi(e_i)) = E_B(p_{j(i)}) = p_{j(i)}$ by the assumption, so that $E_B(\Phi(e_i))$ is a minimal projection. This implies that $S(E_B(\Phi(e_i))) = 0$ for all $i \in J_\lambda$. Hence by Proposition 3.9, we have that

$$H^\lambda(b_\rho(\Phi)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i S(E_B(\Phi(e_i))) = \sum_{i \in J_\lambda} \lambda_i S(E_B(\Phi(e_i))) = 0.$$

1) $\Rightarrow$ 2): Since $\Phi(D_\rho) = \sum_i \lambda_i \Phi(e_i) = \sum_{i \in J_\lambda} \lambda_i \Phi(e_i)$, by combining the fact $\Phi(e_i) = p_{j(i)}$ for all $i \in J_\lambda$, we have that $\{\lambda_i; i \in J_\lambda\}$ is the all non-zero eigenvalues of $\Phi(D_\rho)$ which are of course the all eigenvalues of D_ρ .

It is obvious that 3) $\Rightarrow$ 1), and we have the conclusion by Theorem 3.3. $\square$

References

- [1] M. D. Choi, *A Schwartz inequality for positive linear maps on C^* -algebras*, Ill. J. Math., **18**(1974), 565–574.

- [2] F. Hiai, M. Mosonyi, D. Petz and C. Beny, *Quantum f -divergence and error correction*, Rep. Math. Phys. **23**(2011), 691–747.
- [3] S. Neshveyev and E. Størmer, *Dynamical entropy in operator algebras*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2006).
- [4] M. Ohya and D. Petz, *Quantum entropy and its use*, Texts and Monographs in Physics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1993).
- [5] D. Petz, *Quantum Information Theory and Quantum Statistics*, Theoretical and Mathematical Physics, Springer, Berlin Heidelberg (2008).
- [6] A. B. Poritz and J. A. Poritz, *On entropy-preserving stochastic averages*, Linear Algebra and its Applications **434** (2011), 1425–1442.
- [7] C. E. Shannon, *A mathematical theory of communication*, Bell Syst. Tech., **27**(1948), 379–423.
- [8] E. Størmer, *Positive linear maps of operator algebras*, Springer SMM Berline Heidelberg (2013).
- [9] L. Zhang, J. Wu, *Von Neumann entropy-preserving quantum operation*, Phys. Lett. A 375 (2011) 4163-4165
- [10] K. Życzkowski, M. Kuś, W. Słomczyński and H.-J. Sommers, *Random unistochastic matrices*, J. Phys., **A36** (2003), 3425–3450.